

### REMARKS

Applicants have carefully reviewed and considered the Examiner's Action mailed May 10, 2007, in which claims 47-48 and 53-60 were allowed over the prior art of record and claims 46, 49-51 and 61 were indicated as being allowable over the prior art of record if amended to overcome the indefiniteness rejection, if amended to correct a minor error and rewritten in independent form, respectively as stated on page 7 of the Action. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the comments set forth below.

By this Amendment, claims 45, 46, 49 and 61 are amended and claim 52 is canceled. Indicated allowable dependent claim 61 is rewritten into independent form, and minor modifications are made to claims 46 and 49 to clarify the claimed invention. Accordingly, claims 44-51 and 53-61 are pending in the instant application with claims 46-51 and 53-61 being allowed and placed in condition for allowance.

Claims 44-45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,670, 744 to Buzak. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

#### Argument:

A display system of Buzak is different from the claimed three-dimensional display system of the present application in several points.

a) First, in Figure 1 of Buzak, assuming that each of modulating means 16 and 18 are regarded as a mirror face, a phantom image virtually appears at a symmetrical position of a mirror image contrast to screen 14. That is, a distance at a modulating means 16, 18 of Buzak becomes half of a distance at a virtual face of the phantom image. Thus, the position of the modulating means of Buzak is largely different from that of the

virtual face of the phantom image.

In contrast, a feature of the claimed three-dimensional display device of independent claim 44 is featured in that a position at a shutter face of each shutter is almost consistent with a position at a displayed face of the phantom image in the depth direction.

b) Second, Buzak discloses a technique that one of modulating means 16 or 18 is set to the active state (i.e., reflection) at one moment. See column 4, lines 60-66 of Buzak.

In contrast, the transmittance of each shutter of the claimed invention, which corresponds to a position of each layer of a phantom image in the depth direction, is controlled partially at one moment such that a portion of the phantom image becomes either the transparent state or the non-transparent state.

c) Third, the claimed invention is also featured in that a plurality of the shutter elements for displaying the phantom image are controlled at the same time such that each shutter element is set to opening state without the following case. That is, in that case, shutters are controlled at the same time such that each shutter is set to the partially closing state at one moment, which the phantom image of the back side portion is being displayed, when a portion of the phantom image corresponding to the back side portion of the shutter comes invisible. In this partially closing state, the closing area on the shutter corresponds to a non-transparent area of the phantom image at the corresponding depth to this shutter.

As mentioned above, the claimed invention is featured by:

Feature a) a position of each modulating means being consistent with a position at a

portion of the phantom image in the depth direction;

Feature b) a plurality of shutters for displaying the phantom image are controlled at the same time such that each shutter is set to an opening state or closing state partially at one moment; and

Feature c) when each shutter is controlled at the same time, one portion of the phantom image according to an opening area becomes transparent state to set the back side image through the opening area in a visible state during the opening state, and another portion of the phantom image according to a closing area becomes non-transparent state to set the back side image through the closing area in the invisible state during the closing state.


Since Buzak does not disclose features a)-c) mentioned above, it cannot anticipate the claimed invention set forth in claims 44-45 because it fails to disclose each and every recited element of the claims. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is respectfully requested.

For the above stated reasons, it is submitted that all of the claims are allowable over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that this application be passed to issuance with claims 44-51 and 53-61 being allowed over the prior art of record.

Should the Examiner believe that a conference would advance the prosecution of this application, he is encouraged to telephone the undersigned counsel to arrange such a conference.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 10, 2007



---

Catherine M. Voorhees

Registration No. 33,074

VENABLE LLP

P.O. Box 34385

Washington, D.C. 20043-9998

Telephone: (202) 344-4000

Telefax: (202) 344-8300

CMV/elw